

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRAND LITTLE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PACIFIC SEAFOOD PROCUREMENT,
LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-01098-AGT](#)

SEALING ORDER

Re: Dkt. Nos. 427, 467


In conjunction with a joint discovery letter, dkt. 426, Plaintiffs filed an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material Should Be Sealed, dkt. 427. Portions of the letter and the associated exhibits contain information obtained in discovery that was labeled as confidential by certain Defendants. The Court previously granted the proposed order to seal the documents. Dkt. 467. Upon further reflection, the Court denies the administrative motion to seal. Plaintiffs took no position on whether the documents should be sealed, and Defendants had seven days under the Local Rules to file a statement in support of sealing, which they did not do. *See* Civil. L.R. 79-5(f)(3). In general, the “public has a right of access to the Court’s files[,]” *id.* 79-5(a), which may be overridden only when the party seeking to seal a document explains the legitimate interests that warrant sealing, the injury that will result if sealing is denied, and why less restrictive alternatives to sealing are not sufficient. *Id.* 79-5(c)(1).

The Court’s previous order at Dkt. 467 is reversed and accordingly replaced and

superseded by this order to deny the administrative motion to seal. Plaintiffs must file an unredacted public version of the joint discovery letter and associated exhibits by November 17, 2025.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 10, 2025



Alex G. Tse
United States Magistrate Judge